

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

Rejection of Claims 1-33, 35, 37, 38, 40-50, 52-60, 63 and 66-83 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15, 16, 18-27, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38, 40-47, 50-58, 63, 66-68, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Duphorne et al.(U.S. 6,212,265). In the rejected claims, Claims 1, 20, 40, 52 and 71 are independent.

The rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Duphorne patent fails to teach or suggest a filtering device for suspending a preliminary email notification signal in response to a plurality of set deletion conditions prior to formatting the preliminary email notification signal into the Caller ID-compatible email notification signal.

The system of Duphorne queries the user's ISP email server to determine whether any email addressed to the user is received by and/or stored thereon. The ISP email server 16a receives a query signal from a query software maintained by a central office 14 first or an information service provider so as to transmit a preliminary email notification signal in respond to the query signal. In contrast, the system of the claimed invention includes a filtering device to stop transforming the identification information into the transmission signal if the electronic mail corresponds with some predetermined delete conditions, and to transform the identification information into a transmission signal if the electronic mail corresponds with some predetermined permission conditions.

The method of Duphorne provides a user with a Caller ID-compatible email notification signal indicating that email addressed to the user is received at a remote email server associated with the user. The method comprises a step of transmitting a query signal to the remote email server, a step of transmitting, in response to the query signal, a preliminary email notification signal from the remote email server to a central office coupled to a public switched telephone network, a step of formatting the preliminary email notification signal into the Caller ID-compatible email notification signal according to one or more parameter values, and a step of transmitting the Caller ID-compatible email notification signal from the central office to the user using the public switched telephone network. Consequently, the method of Duphorne does not include or require a step of filtering the preliminary email notification signal before transforming it to a Caller ID-compatible email notification signal, and a step of transforming the preliminary email notification signal into a Caller ID-compatible email notification signal only if the preliminary email notification signal corresponds with predetermined deletion conditions.

In the claimed invention, unlike the system of Duphorne, in case of a user's failure to read the identification information in time, the operation for transferring the identification information may comprise a suspending step and a re-establishing step. The suspending step is for stopping the connection from the receiving terminal and electronic mail provider that is not yet established within a set period, while the re-establishing step is for re-establishing the connection with electronic mail provider and transferring the transmission signal after waiting a standby period. In the preferred embodiment, the set period and standby period can be adjustable. Duphorne does not even remotely suggest such a suspending step and adjustable set and standby periods.

Therefore, the Duphorne does not anticipate or suggest the claimed invention, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, 2, 5-12, 15, 16, 18-27, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38, 40-47, 50-58, 63, 66-68, and 70 under 35 USC 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 28, 29, 48, 49, 59, 60 and 71-83 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 28, 29, 48, 49, 59, 60 and 71-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duphorne in view of Ozaki (U.S. 5,933,478).

This rejection is again respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Ozaki patent, like the Duphorne patent, neither discloses nor suggests an ISP email server that transforms e-mail identification information provided by an electronic mail provider into a transmission signal to be transferred to a non-portable receiving terminal, as claimed.

It is true that the Ozaki patent discloses an active ISP email server which can actively transmit a preliminary email notification signal when a connection between email provider and the receiving terminal is suspended. However, there is no suggestion or teaching that would have suggested modification of the system and method of Duphorne to transform identification information in the manner claimed. Instead, as noted above, Duphorne specifically teaches that querying the user's ISP email server to determine whether any email addressed to the user is received by and/or stored thereon.

Conclusion

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official

Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Urcia', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: May 24, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500